the research and development of software for testing and training products. Kelly's innovative training and testing programs have kept it at the head of its industry. The experience of this Michigan company shows that hard work and dedication to quality service and integrity pave the road to success.

Mr. President, I am proud that Kelly Services, based in Troy, MI, is part of the vibrant and growing business community in my State of Michigan. The quality and innovation shown by this aggressive enterprise under the leadership of President and Chief Executive Officer Terence E. Adderley have been an inspiration to all business people in my State. Through its contributions to area businesses it has improved life in the 37 Michigan communities in which it has branches, as well as the communities all over the world in which it conducts business.

Kelly Services has been celebrating its anniversary throughout this year. The company will host a major event at its headquarters in Troy on October 7. I would like to extend my best wishes to Kelly Services for a festive celebration and for another 50 years of superior success through superior service.●

EMPLOYMENT NONDISCRIMINATION ACT

● Mr. DORGAN. Mr. President, I would like to take this opportunity to explain why I supported the Employment Nondiscrimination Act.

In an earlier vote, I supported the Defense of Marriage Act because I do not believe that we should change the definition of marriage that has made the family—a husband, wife, and children—the cornerstone of our society.

But the Employment Nondiscrimination Act is about a different issue. It is about whether discrimination in the workplace against homosexuals is permissible. I supported this bill because I do not believe we should tolerate discrimination of any type in the workplace.

The people of this Nation already have decided that it is unacceptable to discriminate against someone in the workplace just because of that person's race, gender, or religious beliefs. I just don't believe that one's sexual orientation is relevant to whether or not they can do a job, and it ought not be a permissible basis for discrimination.

This bill includes substantial protections and safeguards for employers. It includes exemptions for the Armed Forces, small businesses, religious institutions, and private membership clubs. Most important, the bill states clearly that it does not protect inappropriate or public sexual conduct by any employee, whether or not that employee is homosexual.

Some people have said that this legislation isn't necessary, that there is no discrimination against homosexuals in the workplace. I would like to give you just one example of why I think this legislation is needed: Ernest Dillon was a postal employee in Detroit, MI. He worked hard and everyone agreed he was good at his job. But that wasn't enough. When Ernest's coworkers found out he was homosexual, they repeatedly taunted him until one day, while he was on the job, they beat him unconscious. Their harassment continued unabated until he was forced out of his job, fearing for his life. Although he went to the courts for relief, there was nothing there to protect him.

It is time for our country to decide that we will not tolerate that kind of discrimination. This legislation does that. Nine States have already enacted legislation similar to this bill.

I have heard from many of my own constituents and from mayors, Governors, religious leaders, corporate CEO's, and others that, regardless of their views about homosexuality, they support this bill because they oppose discrimination in all its forms. I agree, and that is why I voted for this bill.●

THANKS TO PRODIGY SERVICE CORP.

● Mr. GREGG. Mr. President, I rise today to express my thanks to Prodigy Service Corp. for responding promptly to the letter sent out by 19 Senators and myself on August 1, 1996. In the letter, my colleagues and I urged Prodigy and several other Internet service providers and search engines to adopt company policies to block access to bomb-making information through their services.

Prodigy is the first of these companies to respond and I am pleased to announce that letter provides some hope in our efforts to curb the availability of bomb construction information on the Internet. This outstanding company has already begun to offer its customers free installment of the CyberPatrol access control software program, which blocks access to bomb-making information. This generous contribution to our Nation's safety and well-being is commendable.

While Prodigy's efforts help solve the problem of the wide availability of dangerous bomb construction information, the CyberPatrol program also demonstrates that blocking bomb-making instructions on the Internet is possible.

At this time, I ask that the Senate join me in urging other Internet service providers to adopt similar policies. I ask that Prodigy's response be printed in the RECORD.

The letter follows:

PRODIGY,
New York, NY, August 27, 1996.

Hon. JUDD GREGG,
U.S. Senate, Washington, DC.

DEAR SENATOR GREGG: Thank you for your letter of August 1, regarding bomb-making information on the Internet. We, too, are outraged by the cowardly, senseless acts of terrorism that have victimized so many innocent individuals and families. We are repulsed by the twisted minds of people who disseminate bomb-making information for reasons known only to them.

As you know, bomb-making information is available widely and publicly today through a large number of channels, including bookstores and libraries, and governmental attempts to restrict the availability of otherwise lawful information raise serious First Amendment concerns. Nevertheless, Prodigy tries to strike a responsible balance, providing a safe environment for users to openly exchange valuable information, while enabling them to insure they won't come in contact with inappropriate material.

Unlike other media, the online environment does offer an effective way for consumers to exercise control. Earlier this year, Prodigy began offering our members the CyberPatrol access control software program, which they can install on their family's personal computer at no extra charge (Prodigy picks up the cost of the program). This easy-to-use program automatically filters and blocks access to bomb-making information and other inappropriate content on the Internet.

Please feel free to contact me if you have any further questions.

Sincerely,

MARC JACOBSON,
Vice President and General Counsel.●

REPEAL OF SECTION 434 OF THE PERSONAL RESPONSIBILITY AND WORK OPPORTUNITY RECONCILIATION ACT OF 1996

● Mr. MOYNIHAN. Mr. President, yesterday I introduced legislation to repeal section 434 of the recently enacted Personal Responsibility and Work Opportunity Reconciliation Act of 1996. Section 434 provides that:

> Notwithstanding any other provision of Federal, State, or local law, no State or local government entity may be prohibited, or in any way restricted, from sending to or receiving from the Immigration and Naturalization Service INS information regarding the immigration status, lawful or unlawful, of an alien in the United States.

This provision is ill-advised and threatens the public health and safety of residents of New York City because it conflicts with an executive order, issued by the major of New York in 1985, prohibiting city employees from reporting suspected illegal aliens to the Immigration and Naturalization Service unless the alien has been charged with a crime. The executive order, which is similar to local laws in other States and cities, was intended to ensure that fear of deportation does not deter illegal aliens from seeking emergency medical attention, reporting crimes, and so forth.

On September 8, 1995, during Senate consideration of H.R. 4, the Work Opportunity Act of 1995, Senators SANTORUM and NICKLES offered this provision as an amendment. The amendment was adopted by a vote of 91 to 6. The Senators who voted ''no'' were: Senators AKAKA, CAMPBELL, INOUYE, MOSELEY-BRAUN, MOYNIHAN, and SIMON.

Four of these six—Senators AKAKA, MOSELEY-BRAUN, SIMON, and the Senator from New York—were also among the 11 Democrats who voted against H.R. 4 when it passed the Senate on September 19, 1995. H.R. 4, of course, was later vetoed by President Clinton.